



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/877,439	06/08/2001	Hans-Linhard Reich	17209-019	1544
54205	7590	03/01/2006		
CHADBOURNE & PARKE LLP 30 ROCKEFELER PLAZA NEW YORK, NY 10112			EXAMINER DASS, HARISH T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3628	

DATE MAILED: 03/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/877,439

Applicant(s)

REICH ET AL.

Examiner

Harish T. Dass

Art Unit

3628

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 June 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/8/01, 10/9/01.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (APA) in view of Brendan Coffey "Compliance moves forward", Wall Street & Technology, New York; Summer 1997. pg. 28, 3 pages (hereinafter Coffey).

Re. Claims 1 and 21, APA discloses (a) receiving a compliance request having an associated party and indicating a particular instrument associated with an issuer (APA page 2 lines 5-6, i.e. TCO receives the request), (b) retrieving restrictions associated with the particular instrument from a collection of restrictions (APA page 2 lines 5-6, i.e. "telephone or a written or e-mail request". "Once the TCO receives the request"), (c) accessing a compliance rule set identifying at least one compliance rule selected in accordance with a profile associated with the party, the profile reflecting at least the relationship between the party and the entity (APA page 2 lines 6-7, i.e. "TCO compares the underlying security with a list of other companies with which the employee and/or the present company are currently involved."); (d) evaluating at least a portion of the rules in the compliance rule set using the retrieved restrictions to determine if the request complies with the restrictions (APA page 2 lines 10-13, i.e. "determining

Art Unit: 3628

whether the employee can trade in the security. In making this determination, the TCO typically considers whether the company is involved with the security or the issuer, what position the employee holds, what confidential information the employee could be privy to, as well as other factors.”), and (e) outputting a message in electronic form indicating a compliance condition in accordance with results of the evaluating step (APA page 2 lines 13-14, i.e. “Once this evaluation is complete, the TCO notifies the employee with the results of the compliance check.”) to comply with SEC rules and avoid conflict of interest for employee personal trading. Further, spreadsheet (e.g. old lotus 123, Excel) and database (DBII, Oracle 8i, etc) are well known, where the users create lists (tables), sorts the lists with different columns, sort on column and then sort the next column, also provide logical test with condition and find (select) function (e.g. a student list with last name and scores, it can be sorted by the last name then by score, if the last name are same check the first name or other way around.)

APA does not disclose computer system with compliance rule, rule engine and server. Coffey discloses an automatic compliance system and compliance module (rule-engine) to be used for pre-trading compliance for real time to avoid violation. Server is inherent part of most computer system.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the disclosure of APA and use a spreadsheet (database) and create lists of employee, companies, etc such as disclosed by APA and include compliance tools such as computer rule-based module, as disclosed by Coffey, and spreadsheet (database) to modify the lists (tables) without drawing (making) a fresh

lists each time a new employee or client is added or deleted from a list(s), quickly search the names, add a new sheet (table), etc. and adding compliance rules which saves the TCO time during search, retrieve decisions and update the lists for an efficient managing compliance and enforcing tool for employee of financial institutions who are trading securities to avoid conflict of interest.

Re. Claim 2, APA discloses wherein each compliance rule has an associated priority, the priority indicating an order in which the rules are applied during the evaluating step (APA page 2 lines 6-8, i.e. "TCO compares the restriction rules with employees trading security".

Re. Claim 3, APA discloses wherein the restrictions are indicated in a plurality of lists including a first list indicating restrictions related to publicly available information and a second list indicating restrictions related to non-public information (APA page 2 line 8, i.e. "the restriction are listed in different list where some are available publicly and some not" the priority of rules applying to the first list being greater than the priority of rules applying to the second list (APA page 2 lines 10-17, i.e. "if an employee is a ranking member of the institution or member of the company board, their trades are obvious to be given priority compare to an employee of lesser rank whom is only known inside the institution."

Art Unit: 3628

Re. Claims 4-15, APA discloses restriction lists (page 2 lines 7-8) and transaction approval (i.e., The TCO can indicate that the transaction is approved or that it violates one or more trading restrictions because the company is too closely involved in the underlying security and the employee's relationship with the company makes it inappropriate or illegal for them to transact in the security.) and wherein the entity comprises a company and the party comprises one of an employee of the company, a customer of the company, and the company (page 1 lines 12-14).

Using online transactions are well known, where a client is registered with a security trading institution or brokerage firm (e.g., Charles Schwab) server and place an order for trading security using the electronic order form (wherein the request is received from the party and the message is sent to the party), accepting the trading rules, brokerage trading criteria and regulation of the brokerage firm where the transaction criteria are written in submittal document when the trader accepts the rule/criteria, signs and submits the document (embedding the compliance condition message in a representation of the document.). Further, rule-based management information are well known.

APA does not explicitly disclose the restrictions are indicated in least a first list and restrictions in the first list have an associated severity level; the step of retrieving comprising retrieving restrictions from the first list wherein, if a plurality of restrictions associated with the particular instrument is in the first list, retrieving from the first list only the restriction associated with the particular instrument having the highest severity level, and wherein restrictions are transaction restrictions and each restriction has an

Art Unit: 3628

associated severity level selected from a group comprising at least one of a low severity indicating that transactions are permitted for a party in a first category and not permitted for a party in a second category, and a high severity indicating that transactions are not permitted for any party, wherein the first category comprise customers of the entity and the second category comprises employees of the entity, and wherein the severity group further comprises a medium severity indicating that transactions are permitted only with additional approval. It is well known that certain employee of corporations have more inside information and some less, these responsibility brings a restriction severity to comply with sec regulation of inside trading, similarly, theses regulation apply to members of board and leadership.

wherein the step of accessing a compliance rule set comprises: accessing a baseline rule set; accessing at least one additional rule set selected in accordance with the party profile; and combining the accessed baseline rule set and the at least one additional rule set to form the compliance rule set, combining the steps of: accessing rule exception data selected in accordance with the party profile; and removing rules from the compliance rule set in accordance with the rule exception data and wherein the compliance request comprises an electronic document containing data indicating a company name; the method further comprising the steps of extracting the company name from the document and mapping the extracted company name to an associated instrument.

It is a business choice to categorize the TCO lists based on the business experience and dealing with its customer, and who the customer is, if the customer is a

Art Unit: 3628

public figure (i.e., story of Martha Stewart is the latest public figure involved in news of inside trading.) has higher severity level than say Pinky Shaw a low level employee in some financial institution. Create a base-line for its business to minimize the damages can cause by inside trading. Similarly, printing logo and transferring data from on file to another are known to avoid typing.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the Applicant's invention was made to modify disclosure (APA) and Coffey and add rules which are suited to the business and complies with the government regulation to prevent inside-trading by the company employee or the client who is some corporation director, public figure or a financial advisor who has propriety information.

Re. Claims 16-20, and 22-34, claims 16-20 and 22-34 having substantially similar limitations as claims 1-15 and are rejected with same rationales as rejection of claims 1-15 over APA in view of Coffey.

Conclusion

In response to this office action, applicant is requested to add a statement that, new matter is added, or provide support for added limitation (specification page number and lines, specially if the limitation is not clear.)

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is required under 37 CFR ' 1.111 (c) to consider the

references fully when responding to this action.

US 5446885 (Moore et al) "Event Driven Management Information System with Rule-Based Applications Structure Stored in a Relational Database" discloses a rule-based computer application structure which utilizes rules which are stored separately from the application program, having the rules stored separately from the application program permits the user, a non-technical person, to easily modify existing rules and create new rules and store them in database, rules are stored as objects in the database, they are easy to locate and retrieve and rules are separate from the application programs, modifications to the rules are easier to accomplish.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Harish T. Dass whose telephone number is 571-272-6793. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM to 4:50 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hyung S. Sough can be reached on 571-272-6799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3628

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Harish T Dass
Examiner
Art Unit 3628



2/21/06